

EXHIBIT 25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

In re:

THE FINANCIAL OVERSIGHT AND PROMESA
MANAGEMENT BOARD FOR PUERTO
RICO, Title III
as representative of
THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO,
et al.,
Debtors.

In re:

THE FINANCIAL OVERSIGHT AND
MANAGEMENT BOARD OF PUERTO RICO,
as representative of
PUERTO RICO ELECTRIC POWER AUTHORITY,
Debtor.

* P R O F E S S I O N A L E Y E S O N L Y *

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION
OF
FERNANDO L. BATLLE HERNAIZ
New York, New York
Friday, October 11, 2019

Reported by:

ANNETTE ARLEQUIN, CCR, RPR, CRR, CLR
JOB NO. 169103

Page 70	Page 71
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 before? 3 A. Yes, I have seen them. 4 Q. And is it fair to say that in 5 these letters, the members of Congress who 6 wrote them are critical of the definitive 7 RSA? 8 MS. McKEEN: Objection. The 9 documents speak for themselves. 10 You can answer. 11 A. Yes, in this letter, they express 12 their opinion about the RSA and other 13 topics related to Puerto Rico's energy 14 sector. 15 Q. So among other things, on the 16 second page of the first letter, it says, 17 "The new PREPA RSA also conflicts with 18 Puerto Rico's goal to grow its economy." 19 Do you see that? 20 A. I'm sorry, where are you, sir? 21 Q. The third paragraph down. 22 A. The second page, you said? 23 Q. Yes. 24 A. I'm sorry. 25 (Document review.)</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 A. Yes, I see that, sir. 3 Q. Do you agree with that statement? 4 MS. DALE: Objection. 5 A. No. 6 Q. Has any analysis been undertaken 7 by PREPA or AAFAF to determine the effect 8 that the RSA has on Puerto Rico's goal to 9 grow its economy? 10 MS. McKEEN: Objection. Outside 11 the scope of the 30(b)(6) topics and 12 the topics that the court has said are 13 within the proper scope of the 9019. 14 You can answer if you know. 15 A. No. 16 Q. No analysis has been undertaken 17 to that degree? 18 A. AAFAF did not undertake or PREPA 19 undertake any analysis related to this. 20 Q. Did anyone else to your 21 knowledge? 22 A. I don't know. 23 Q. Let's look at the first page. 24 Sorry for going out of order here. It 25 says, "National and local policy experts</p>
Page 72	Page 73
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 agree that the new PREPA RSA is excessively 3 generous to creditors." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, I do. 6 Q. Do you agree with that statement? 7 A. No. 8 Q. So it's your position that the -- 9 well, for the record, what is the range of 10 recoveries that the RSA provides to 11 creditors, to the settling bondholders 12 creditors? 13 A. The RSA establishes a recovery of 14 67.5 percent on tranche A and up to 10 15 percent on tranche B. 16 Q. So up to 77.5 percent? 17 A. Potentially, yes. 18 Q. So in your view, a 77.5 percent 19 recovery is not overly generous to the 20 settling creditors? 21 A. Well, in my view, given all of 22 the factors that have to be considered, it 23 is something that I believe is reasonable, 24 a reasonable recovery. 25 Q. When you say "all the factors</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 that have to be considered," what do you 3 mean by that? 4 A. Well, as I stated earlier in my 5 testimony today, achieving PREPA's 6 transformation is a key objective of the 7 government parties. And in that context, 8 achieving a resolution to the restructuring 9 of PREPA's debt is, as I've stated before, 10 a key goal of the government parties. 11 As part of that, there was a 12 negotiation that was reached. And we 13 believe -- when I say "we," the parties 14 that were involved in these negotiations -- 15 that the settlement that was reached was a 16 reasonable one. 17 Q. So let me go back to the 77.5 18 percent recovery. 19 That does not include other 20 components of consideration that are 21 included in the RSA, right? 22 A. That is correct. There are other 23 considerations related to the amount of 24 time, for example, that creditors have to 25 wait until the close of this transaction.</p>

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 And those are separate from the 67 and a
3 half and the up to 10 percent of tranche B.

4 Q. That includes, for example,
5 settlement payments?

6 A. Yes. There is a settlement
7 charge payment of one cent.

8 Q. And an administrative claim, for
9 example?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And a waiver and support fee for
12 certain creditors?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Anything else I'm missing?

15 A. Not that I recall, no.

16 Q. Has PREPA or AAFAF performed any
17 calculation of what the total recovery
18 percentages are as a percentage of the
19 bondholders' prepetition claims once all of
20 those additional components of
21 consideration are added in?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. What was the result?

24 A. I'm going to have to give you an
25 approximate answer. I don't recall if that

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 number was probably like another 4 percent,
3 maybe 4 and a half percent, somewhere
4 around there, if I recall correctly.

5 Q. So what you're telling me is all
6 in, roughly 81 or 81 and a half or 82
7 percent?

8 A. Yeah, but I don't view that as
9 part of the recovery of a bondholders.
10 That is related to an important part of
11 what the RSA accomplishes, which is it
12 allows for the time to take place to have
13 the transformation process finished.

14 Q. Well, what do you mean it allows
15 for the time --

16 A. Well --

17 Q. -- for the transformation to
18 continue?

19 MS. McKEEN: Let him finish.

20 THE WITNESS: My apologies.

21 A. So the transformation process is
22 a complicated process that eventually leads
23 to selecting a proponent that will run the
24 transmission and distribution operations of
25 PREPA. That process is ongoing. And that

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 process will probably not be finished until
3 sometime in the summer of 2020.

4 And so in the meantime, what this
5 tries to accomplish, what this attempts to
6 accomplish is to account for that period of
7 time and to provide a compensation to
8 bondholders that have agreed not to pursue
9 any remedies, whatever they are, that they
10 could have against PREPA and the
11 government.

12 Q. Why are they entitled to that
13 compensation?

14 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form
15 of the question.

16 A. That was part of a negotiation
17 between the parties.

18 Q. Okay. But why did PREPA and
19 AAFAF agree to that?

20 A. Because we thought that it was a
21 reasonable request and that it was an
22 important part of being able to find a
23 final, a definitive RSA with the supporting
24 holders.

25 Q. Why couldn't you have waited to

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 enter into the RSA until the transformation
3 process is ready to close?

4 A. Because as I have stated earlier,
5 solving PREPA's debt restructuring process
6 is an important part of eliminating the
7 uncertainty related to an ongoing
8 bankruptcy process that would facilitate
9 the billing process for the transformation
10 of PREPA.

11 Q. So you don't think the
12 transformation process would continue
13 without settlement of the bond claims under
14 the RSA now?

15 MS. McKEEN: Objection.

16 Misstates testimony.

17 A. I believe that the signing of the
18 definitive RSA is an important step in
19 providing stability as it relates to the
20 debt part of the transaction that will give
21 more certainty to the bidders that are part
22 of the transformation process.

23 Q. How do you know that the bidders
24 need more certainty in order to continue
25 the process and eventually execute an

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 agreement for the transformation?

3 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form
4 of the question.

5 A. If you are part of a process to
6 run an entity like PREPA and you have an
7 open item related to potential endless
8 litigation that could lead to a receiver
9 which will try to run what you're being
10 asked to bid on and the complications that
11 that relates to, I think as a -- if I put
12 myself in the shoes of a bidder, I would
13 like to have certainty about how PREPA will
14 exit from the bankruptcy process.

15 Q. Have you actually spoken to any
16 of the bidders in the process?

17 A. I am not part of that process.

18 Q. Has PREPA or AAFAF?

19 A. This process is run by the P3
20 Authority, so I wouldn't be able to answer
21 who has had the direct conversations with
22 them.

23 Q. How long has the transformation
24 process been -- when did it begin?

25 A. I don't recall the exact date,

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 but it was after Hurricane Maria. So it
3 was probably sometime, I would say, early
4 2018, maybe. First half of 2018.

5 Q. Was that before or after the
6 execution of the preliminary RSA?

7 A. I believe it was before the
8 execution of the preliminary RSA.

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only

Page 98	Page 99
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 transaction, it's a combination of what the</p> <p>3 economic recovery is, but there is also</p> <p>4 other very important benefits such as a</p> <p>5 limitation of remedies, such as capping the</p> <p>6 transition charge, and those are very</p> <p>7 important considerations as well in</p> <p>8 addition to the recovery level.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. So considering that there</p> <p>10 are these other benefits you believe the</p> <p>11 RSA has, would an 85 percent recovery to</p> <p>12 bondholders been reasonable to you?</p> <p>13 MS. McKEEN: Objection. Calls</p> <p>14 for speculation.</p> <p>15 MR. BEREZIN: Hypothetical.</p> <p>16 A. I believe that the deal structure</p> <p>17 is a reasonable deal and any other number</p> <p>18 is irrelevant at this stage. We struck a</p> <p>19 deal for 67 and a half with an up</p> <p>20 additional 10 percent recovery in the</p> <p>21 tranche B, and we believe that's a</p> <p>22 reasonable number.</p> <p>23 I mean, is 85 reasonable? I tell</p> <p>24 you what I think is reasonable, which is</p> <p>25 the current agreement.</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 Q. So if the current agreement was</p> <p>3 exactly the same as it is today, except the</p> <p>4 recovery was instead of 77 and a half</p> <p>5 percent on the two tranches, a total of 85</p> <p>6 percent, you don't have a view as to</p> <p>7 whether or not PREPA or AAFAF would have</p> <p>8 approved that deal?</p> <p>9 MS. McKEEN: Same objections.</p> <p>10 Calls for speculation. I'll counsel</p> <p>11 the witness not to guess or speculate.</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I'm not going to speculate</p> <p>13 whether that be would be a reasonable</p> <p>14 number or not. I want to repeat one more</p> <p>15 time that I believe that the current</p> <p>16 recovery levels are reasonable, are a</p> <p>17 reasonable settlement.</p> <p>18 Q. So you mentioned these other</p> <p>19 benefits that you believe the settlement</p> <p>20 has, including, I think you said, capping</p> <p>21 the transition charge. You mentioned other</p> <p>22 provisions of the new bonds regarding</p> <p>23 remedies. And you also mentioned effect on</p> <p>24 the transformation.</p> <p>25 Is that fair?</p>
Page 100	Page 101
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 A. Yes, that's fair.</p> <p>3 Q. Did PREPA undertake any effort to</p> <p>4 quantify the value of each of those other,</p> <p>5 and I'll call them "non-economic benefits"</p> <p>6 of the RSA?</p> <p>7 MS. McKEEN: Objection to the</p> <p>8 form of the question.</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 MS. McKEEN: You can answer.</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. What efforts were undertaken to</p> <p>13 do that?</p> <p>14 A. Well, for example, let's talk</p> <p>15 about rates. So under the current RSA, you</p> <p>16 have a capped rate level that starts</p> <p>17 slightly under 3 cents and then goes up</p> <p>18 over time up to 4.55, I believe. And if</p> <p>19 you compare that to not having an RSA, for</p> <p>20 example, and seeing what the debt service</p> <p>21 would look like, there is a significant</p> <p>22 difference, meaning the RSA much lower than</p> <p>23 that.</p> <p>24 If you take the capping concept</p> <p>25 and you look at the current RSA, it --</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 regardless of demand, you will have the</p> <p>3 same charge, the same transition charge.</p> <p>4 If you didn't have that kind of a</p> <p>5 protection, which you did not or you do not</p> <p>6 under the trust agreement because you have</p> <p>7 a rate covenant, and you lower demand, all</p> <p>8 that means is that that -- the equivalent</p> <p>9 of the transition charge would go up and so</p> <p>10 -- in a material way, potentially,</p> <p>11 depending how much demand goes down.</p> <p>12 So I believe that just that</p> <p>13 element of it provides significant benefits</p> <p>14 in the certainty that it provides to</p> <p>15 ratepayers and in having shifted one of the</p> <p>16 bigger risks you have, which is demand</p> <p>17 risk, to bondholders.</p> <p>18 Q. So did you quantify that in terms</p> <p>19 of how much that was worth as far as</p> <p>20 percentage recoveries to bondholders?</p> <p>21 A. No, I did not do a detailed</p> <p>22 analysis of what it represented for</p> <p>23 bondholders.</p> <p>24 Q. Now you mentioned that in your</p> <p>25 view, absent the settlement, rates could</p>

Page 102	Page 103
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 increase under the existing trust agreement 3 going forward beyond the level that are 4 capped by the transition charge; is that 5 right? 6 A. That is correct. 7 Q. Is it your understanding that any 8 increase in rates would have to be approved 9 by the Puerto Rico, the relevant Puerto 10 Rico energy regulator, which is PREB? 11 MS. McKEEN: Objection to the 12 extent it calls for legal testimony. 13 You can answer if you know. 14 A. Well, I'm not a regulatory 15 expert, but the PREB has purview every 16 PREPA's activities, and they would probably 17 have to undergo a rate case to approve or 18 disapprove rates. 19 Q. Okay. So as the representative 20 for PREPA and AAFAF testifying here today 21 in support of the RSA, do you have an 22 understanding as to whether or not PREB 23 would have actually increased rates going 24 forward under the trust agreement? 25 MS. McKEEN: Objection. Calls</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 for speculation. 3 I'm sorry, I just want to make 4 sure I understand the question. 5 Are you asking if he knows what 6 PREB would do? 7 MR. BASSETT: I'm asking him if 8 he has any understanding of what PREB 9 would do. 10 MS. McKEEN: Okay. Calls for 11 speculation. 12 You can answer if you know what 13 PREB would do. 14 A. I don't know what they would do 15 other than carry out the responsibilities 16 of PREPA's regulator. 17 Q. Okay. Did you receive any advice 18 from anyone as to the likelihood that rates 19 would actually increase absent the 20 settlement? 21 A. No. 22 Q. So another non-economic -- has 23 PREPA or AAFAF had any conversations with 24 anyone at PREB about the RSA? 25 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form</p>
Page 104	Page 105
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 of the question. 3 A. I don't know specifically whether 4 PREB or AAFAF have had conversations about 5 the RSA with PREB. 6 MR. LYNCH: Counsel, sorry to 7 interrupt, but are we at a point where 8 we might be able to downgrade the 9 confidentiality designation back to 10 confidential? 11 MS. McKEEN: Yes. And I think 12 since we have come back from our break, 13 there is nothing that I would have 14 designated as attorneys' eyes only. So 15 for purposes of the transcript, we can 16 stop that designation as of when we 17 went off the record, which I believe 18 was around 11 a.m. ^ RQ 19 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. Sorry to 20 interrupt. 21 BY MR. BASSETT: 22 Q. So back to the other non-economic 23 benefits, as we were calling them, one was 24 the effect of the RSA on the transformation 25 process.</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 Did you undertake any effort to 3 quantify the value of that benefit to PREPA 4 and AAFAF? 5 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form 6 of the question. 7 A. As part of our deliberations, we 8 had conversations with counsel where 9 counsel would advise us of the 10 implications, both in time and potential 11 cost, of a prolonged Title III process and 12 the potential litigation related to, 13 including the lien challenge and the 14 receivership. And that formed part of our, 15 of the information we reviewed as part of 16 our decision-making process. 17 Q. Okay. But was it -- did PREPA or 18 AAFAF arrive at any conclusion as to the 19 value of this benefit of the RSA which is 20 its effect on the transformation process in 21 terms of percentage recoveries to 22 bondholders that it would be willing to 23 give in the settlement? 24 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form 25 of the question.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 A. We did not specifically</p> <p>3 incorporate the analysis that I just</p> <p>4 described that was performed with counsel.</p> <p>5 And I will again repeat that there are</p> <p>6 non-economic value to being able to provide</p> <p>7 certainty to the proponents that are</p> <p>8 bidding for the transformation -- for the</p> <p>9 operation of the transmission distribution</p> <p>10 system at PREPA, and that in itself is one</p> <p>11 of the important reasons why we entered</p> <p>12 into the RSA.</p> <p>13 Q. But just to be clear, yes or no,</p> <p>14 you did not put a percentage value on that</p> <p>15 benefit in terms of recoveries to</p> <p>16 bondholders?</p> <p>17 A. No.</p> <p>18 Q. You mentioned several times the</p> <p>19 benefit of resolving certain outstanding</p> <p>20 litigation, including the receivership</p> <p>21 litigation; is that right?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. What other litigation does this</p> <p>24 resolve?</p> <p>25 There's other litigation with</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 bondholders, correct?</p> <p>3 A. The litigation right now is --</p> <p>4 you have the receivership motion and lien</p> <p>5 challenge. I would defer to counsel for</p> <p>6 the a list of the other litigation. I</p> <p>7 don't recall.</p> <p>8 Q. In PREPA and AAFAF's</p> <p>9 consideration of the RSA, did they have an</p> <p>10 understanding as to the potential best-case</p> <p>11 outcomes in litigation with the</p> <p>12 bondholders?</p> <p>13 MS. McKEEN: I'll object to the</p> <p>14 extent the question would require the</p> <p>15 witness to testify regarding the</p> <p>16 content of conversations with counsel</p> <p>17 about the likely outcome of litigation.</p> <p>18 I'll instruct that the witness</p> <p>19 can testify "yes" or "no" as to whether</p> <p>20 there was an understanding, but not</p> <p>21 what that understanding was.</p> <p>22 A. Okay. Can you repeat your</p> <p>23 question?</p> <p>24 Q. I'll rephrase it.</p> <p>25 Do you understand that in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 litigation with the bondholders, the</p> <p>3 government parties, including PREPA and</p> <p>4 AAFAF, have taken the position that the</p> <p>5 bondholders are unsecured?</p> <p>6 MS. McKEEN: I'll object to the</p> <p>7 extent it calls for the witness to</p> <p>8 testify regarding legal conclusions and</p> <p>9 legal positions that have been taken at</p> <p>10 various litigation. The position that</p> <p>11 the parties have taken in that</p> <p>12 litigation is a matter of public</p> <p>13 record.</p> <p>14 MR. BASSETT: She did not</p> <p>15 instruct you not to answer.</p> <p>16 A. I'll refer you to the public</p> <p>17 record as to what the government parties'</p> <p>18 position is.</p> <p>19 Q. So you have no understanding --</p> <p>20 as the representative for PREPA and AAFAF</p> <p>21 who is here today supporting the</p> <p>22 settlement, you have no understanding as to</p> <p>23 the position that PREPA and AAFAF are</p> <p>24 taking in litigation against the</p> <p>25 bondholders?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 MS. McKEEN: Objection.</p> <p>3 Misstates testimony. It's not what the</p> <p>4 witness said.</p> <p>5 A. I won't agree with that</p> <p>6 statement, Counsel, and I would refer you</p> <p>7 to the public record, and that is what the</p> <p>8 government parties' position is. I never</p> <p>9 said I had no understanding.</p> <p>10 Q. So do you understand that the</p> <p>11 government parties have taken the position</p> <p>12 that the bondholders are unsecured?</p> <p>13 MS. McKEEN: Same objection.</p> <p>14 You can answer if you know.</p> <p>15 A. The government parties, as part</p> <p>16 of their analysis, have determined that</p> <p>17 there is, yes, a chance that the</p> <p>18 bondholders are unsecured bondholders.</p> <p>19 Q. And if the bondholders are</p> <p>20 unsecured, do you think that the settlement</p> <p>21 is reasonable?</p> <p>22 MS. McKEEN: Objection. This</p> <p>23 calls for legal conclusions and would</p> <p>24 require the witness to divulge the</p> <p>25 content of his conversations with</p>

Page 110	Page 111
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 counsel regarding the likely outcome of</p> <p>3 litigation, as well as calls for</p> <p>4 speculation.</p> <p>5 I'm going to instruct the witness</p> <p>6 not to answer that question.</p> <p>7 BY MR. BASSETT:</p> <p>8 Q. Did you -- this is a "yes" or</p> <p>9 "no" question.</p> <p>10 Did you receive any advice from</p> <p>11 counsel as to the likelihood of the</p> <p>12 government parties prevailing in their</p> <p>13 litigation against the bondholders?</p> <p>14 MS. McKEEN: I'll instruct the</p> <p>15 witness that he can answer that</p> <p>16 question with a "yes" or "no," but that</p> <p>17 he cannot reveal the content of any of</p> <p>18 that advice, if he did receive advice</p> <p>19 from counsel, about the likelihood of</p> <p>20 the outcome of litigation.</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. How did that advice factor into</p> <p>23 your decision to approve the RSA?</p> <p>24 A. That advice, among other pieces</p> <p>25 of information, led us to believe that the</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 current RSA is reasonable, and that's why</p> <p>3 we entered in the current RSA.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you have an understanding that</p> <p>5 the bonds subject to the RSA are</p> <p>6 nonrecourse?</p> <p>7 MS. McKEEN: Objection. Calls</p> <p>8 for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>9 You can answer if you know.</p> <p>10 That's outside of the scope of</p> <p>11 the topics.</p> <p>12 A. I don't know.</p> <p>13 Q. As someone with your experience</p> <p>14 in the industry, including at GDB and being</p> <p>15 involved in debt issuances, do you have an</p> <p>16 understanding, generally, of what it means</p> <p>17 for a bond to be nonrecourse?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>19 Q. What is that understanding?</p> <p>20 A. That you're recourse is limited</p> <p>21 to whatever your source of repayment is,</p> <p>22 generally speaking, obviously.</p> <p>23 Q. And according to the testimony</p> <p>24 you just gave, PREPA and AAFAF, when</p> <p>25 deciding to approve the RSA, did not have</p>
Page 112	Page 113
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 an understanding as to whether or not these</p> <p>3 bonds are nonrecourse?</p> <p>4 MS. McKEEN: Objection.</p> <p>5 Misstates testimony, Counsel.</p> <p>6 Do you want to rephrase the</p> <p>7 question?</p> <p>8 MR. BASSETT: No.</p> <p>9 A. PREPA and AAFAF were provided</p> <p>10 with legal advice and that legal advice</p> <p>11 was --</p> <p>12 MS. McKEEN: I'm going to caution</p> <p>13 the witness not to reveal the content</p> <p>14 of any communications with counsel.</p> <p>15 But if you can answer in a way that</p> <p>16 doesn't reveal the content of those</p> <p>17 communications, then please do so.</p> <p>18 A. All right. I cannot do so.</p> <p>19 Q. So to be clear, you said before</p> <p>20 you did not have an understanding as to</p> <p>21 whether or not the PREPA bonds were</p> <p>22 nonrecourse. I can read back the</p> <p>23 testimony.</p> <p>24 A. Yes, please read back the</p> <p>25 testimony.</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 Q. "Question: Do you have an</p> <p>3 understanding that the bonds subject to the</p> <p>4 RSA are nonrecourse?"</p> <p>5 Your counsel objected.</p> <p>6 Your answer: "I don't know."</p> <p>7 A. Okay. If I may, I'd like to take</p> <p>8 that back and say that I know and that</p> <p>9 AAFAF and PREPA know. But as part -- that</p> <p>10 was part of the conversation with counsel,</p> <p>11 and so I'm not going to divulge the content</p> <p>12 of that conversation.</p> <p>13 Q. So you were mistaken when you</p> <p>14 gave that answer previously?</p> <p>15 A. You're putting words in my mouth,</p> <p>16 sir. I am telling you that I am redacting</p> <p>17 that comment -- I am taking back that</p> <p>18 comment that I made and telling you that as</p> <p>19 part of our deliberation, we received legal</p> <p>20 advice. And I've been instructed by</p> <p>21 counsel not to divulge the contents of</p> <p>22 those conversations.</p> <p>23 Q. So when PREPA and AAFAF approved</p> <p>24 the RSA, did they have an understanding as</p> <p>25 to whether or not the bonds were recourse</p>

Page 114	Page 115
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 or nonrecourse? 3 MR. HAMERMAN: Asked and 4 answered. 5 MS. McKEEN: You can answer the 6 question. 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. What was your understanding? 9 MS. McKEEN: Same objections. 10 You can answer if you know. It's 11 outside the scope, but you can answer. 12 A. PREPA's -- 13 MR. HAMERMAN: Objection insofar 14 as it calls for a legal conclusion. 15 A. It is my understanding that the 16 bonds that we're discussing here today 17 are -- it's the government's position that 18 they are unsecured creditors as part of the 19 -- they're unsecured as part of the 20 position that the government has adopted in 21 the public records. 22 Q. You did not answer my question. 23 A. Can you ask the question again, 24 please? 25 Q. You said that PREPA and AAFAF had</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 an understanding as to whether or not the 3 bonds were recourse are or nonrecourse. 4 I'm asking you were they recourse 5 or nonrecourse? 6 MS. McKEEN: Same objections. 7 You can answer if you know. 8 MR. HAMERMAN: Objection insofar 9 as it calls for a legal conclusion. 10 It's not a knowable thing. 11 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, sir? 12 MR. HAMERMAN: I just said it's 13 not a knowable thing. It's a legal 14 conclusion. 15 MR. LYNCH: I object to the 16 speechifying and the coaching of the 17 witness. 18 A. I will limit my statements to 19 saying that I am not going to divulge the 20 contents of our conversations, my 21 conversations, AAFAF and PREPA, with 22 counsel. 23 Q. A couple of times I believe 24 you -- actually, can we go back and look 25 at, I'm sorry, exhibit -- the document</p>
Page 116	Page 117
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 that's been marked as Batlle Exhibit 6. 3 Do you have that, sir? 4 A. Yes, sir. 5 Q. Go the second page of that 6 document. Item No. 5 in the considerations 7 list, if I can direct your attention to 8 that. 9 (Witness complies.) 10 Q. And this says -- and I'm not 11 going to quote the entire passage, but that 12 "The preliminary RSA provides a more 13 favorable resolution than the transaction 14 contemplated in the original restructuring 15 support agreement." 16 Do you see that? 17 A. Yes, I do. 18 Q. And I think you mentioned before 19 that when PREPA and AAFAF were considering 20 the preliminary RSA, they compared it to 21 the prior RSA that existed; is that 22 correct? 23 A. That is correct. 24 Q. What prior RSA was that? 25 A. That was the agreement that was</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 originally agreed to by -- under the García 3 Padilla administration as modified at the 4 beginning of the first few months of 2017 5 by the Rosselló administration. 6 Q. So I guess what I'm trying to 7 understand is, why did PREPA and AAFAF 8 believe that that was a -- you know, that a 9 comparison between the preliminary RSA and 10 the previous RSA was a relevant thing to 11 consider in determining whether to approve 12 the preliminary RSA? 13 A. So if you are proposing to enter 14 into this RSA, it is only logical to be 15 able to say whether this is better or not 16 than the prior agreement that was in place. 17 And so to me, it is a very fair and logical 18 analysis to do. 19 Q. But the fact that it's better 20 than another agreement that was ultimately 21 not approved does not really have any 22 bearing on whether this agreement is 23 reasonable, does it? 24 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form 25 of the question.</p>

Page 122

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 document, just a couple of other questions
3 on another topic.
4 So you mentioned that Mr. Sobrino
5 was the lead negotiator outside of advisers
6 for PREPA and AAFAF on the RSA, correct?
7 A. Correct.
8 Q. How often did you communicate
9 with Mr. Sobrino about the RSA?
10 A. Regularly. I mean, depending on
11 whether there were issues to be discussed,
12 we had, we had communication.
13 Q. And how did you communicate?
14 A. Typically with Nancy Mitchell,
15 who was the lead counsel. And it could
16 have been any combination of either phone
17 calls or other electronic means.
18 Q. When you say "other electronic
19 means," does that include text messages?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. How often did you text with
22 Mr. Sobrino?
23 A. You know, as needed. I can't
24 tell you that it was every day. Maybe
25 sometimes every day, sometimes not. I

Page 124

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 communicate via Telegram versus text, for
3 example?
4 A. I wouldn't say there was any real
5 logic. Many times it was just the way he
6 asked. He would ask maybe a question or
7 where are you or whatever the topic might
8 have been. And it could have been through
9 either of the two means. I don't really
10 know how to answer what was the --
11 Q. Is one easier than the other?
12 A. I don't know.
13 Q. There weren't certain topics that
14 you discussed with him on Telegram and
15 others that you discussed on texts and
16 others that you discussed on email?
17 A. No, I don't think there was any
18 selection of anything. It was just the way
19 he communicated.
20 Q. Did you provide all of your
21 telegram chat messages with Mr. Sobrino to
22 counsel?
23 A. Yes, I did.
24 Q. Are you aware of any -- are you
25 aware of any Telegram conversations you had

Page 123

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 mean, so as needed.
3 Q. Regarding the RSA?
4 A. Regarding the RSA.
5 Q. Did you provide all the texts
6 that you had with Mr. Sobrino to counsel in
7 connection with our document request?
8 A. Yes, I did.
9 Q. You're not aware of any texts you
10 may have had with Mr. Sobrino that were not
11 provided to counsel?
12 A. No, I'm not aware of any that
13 wasn't provided.
14 Q. Any that were deleted from your
15 phone?
16 A. No.
17 Q. Did you communicate with
18 Mr. Sobrino by any chat applications such
19 as Telegram?
20 A. Yes, at times, yes, too.
21 Q. How often?
22 A. In as needed. It was one of the
23 ways that he communicated with people. And
24 so as needed, I would communicate with him.
25 Q. How would you decide to

Page 125

1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only
2 with Mr. Sobrino that had been deleted or
3 that at one time existed but no longer
4 exist?
5 A. Yeah, there could have been --
6 not being an expert, but the way sometimes
7 you would form groups and those groups you
8 could be removed from or not, and there
9 were probably some that at some point were,
10 because the topic was no longer relevant or
11 could have been deleted, that yes.
12 Q. So you may have had Telegram
13 conversations with Mr. Sobrino that no
14 longer exist and therefore you did not
15 provide to counsel?
16 A. I mean, I guess, theoretically,
17 yes, I just don't recall whether there were
18 any of them that were deleted related to
19 the topics that were here.
20 Q. Okay.
21 A. And I did not have any control
22 about that, right?
23 Q. And this is after -- this is
24 after I think you said you received a hold
25 notice regarding this litigation?

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form</p> <p>3 of the question.</p> <p>4 A. Yeah, I provided, sir -- I'm here</p> <p>5 to be truthful and honest, obviously under</p> <p>6 oath about what I know, and I think I</p> <p>7 provided everything that I had.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. But there may have been</p> <p>9 some that you didn't?</p> <p>10 A. Well, I provided what I had.</p> <p>11 MS. McKEEN: And I'll just object</p> <p>12 to the form of the question. It may</p> <p>13 have been some that you didn't what?</p> <p>14 MR. BASSETT: Provide to counsel</p> <p>15 because they no longer existed.</p> <p>16 A. Well, I don't know if in those</p> <p>17 chats that I'm saying that could have been</p> <p>18 deleted, if there were any contents related</p> <p>19 to my deposition here today, but I provided</p> <p>20 everything I had.</p> <p>21 Q. Did you communicate with</p> <p>22 Mr. Sobrino by any other means other than</p> <p>23 texts and Telegram, other chat apps, et</p> <p>24 cetera?</p> <p>25 A. No. As I said, I communicated</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 through either email, Telegram, text, or</p> <p>3 phone, or in person.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you communicate with anyone</p> <p>5 else regarding the RSA by text?</p> <p>6 A. I did with counsel, with Nancy</p> <p>7 Mitchell, and probably with Maria DiConza</p> <p>8 as well. And there might have been some</p> <p>9 communication with maybe the Citi advisers,</p> <p>10 namely, David Brownstein. But whatever</p> <p>11 communications I had in my phone related to</p> <p>12 this, to the topics of this deposition, I</p> <p>13 turned over to counsel.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And just back to Telegram</p> <p>15 for one second, do you understand that you</p> <p>16 could have saved conversations that</p> <p>17 occurred on Telegram if you had wanted to,</p> <p>18 right?</p> <p>19 A. I don't --</p> <p>20 MS. McKEEN: Objection to form of</p> <p>21 the question.</p> <p>22 BY MR. BASSETT:</p> <p>23 Q. You don't have any understanding</p> <p>24 of that?</p> <p>25 A. No, I don't know.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 Q. To what extent have you</p> <p>3 communicated with José Ortiz, PREPA's CEO,</p> <p>4 regarding the RSA?</p> <p>5 A. I did not have direct</p> <p>6 communication with Mr. Ortiz about the RSA.</p> <p>7 Q. You've never had any</p> <p>8 communications with him?</p> <p>9 A. No, not about the RSA.</p> <p>10 Q. About the proposed</p> <p>11 transformation?</p> <p>12 A. No. Very limited, if any, direct</p> <p>13 conversations about it.</p> <p>14 Q. What was Mr. Ortiz's role in the</p> <p>15 negotiation and approval of the RSA?</p> <p>16 A. Mr. Ortiz's role in the</p> <p>17 negotiation of the RSA was very limited.</p> <p>18 He was the CEO of PREPA. Mr. Sobrino kept</p> <p>19 him and the board of PREPA abreast of what</p> <p>20 was going on, but he did not have a direct</p> <p>21 involvement in the negotiations of the RSA.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Let's go back to what's</p> <p>23 been marked as Exhibit 9.</p> <p>24 Do you recognize this document,</p> <p>25 Mr. Batlle?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>3 Q. And who is -- this is an email</p> <p>4 sent by Eduardo Muñoz. Who is that?</p> <p>5 A. Mr. Arosemena was a member of the</p> <p>6 board of PREPA. He was a government</p> <p>7 employee. If I recall correctly, he was at</p> <p>8 that time in the Secretary of State agency,</p> <p>9 and he also acted as secretary of the board</p> <p>10 of PREPA.</p> <p>11 Q. And he's sending this email to --</p> <p>12 is that -- the people listed in the "to"</p> <p>13 field there, are those the PREPA governing</p> <p>14 board members?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And this email was sent on</p> <p>17 April 16, 2019. And then it says, "Just</p> <p>18 received the documents for tomorrow's 10</p> <p>19 a.m. meeting on the PREPA RSA. Please let</p> <p>20 us know if you need anything from our end."</p> <p>21 Do you see that?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>23 Q. First of all, is it your</p> <p>24 understanding that the meeting to approve</p> <p>25 the PREPA RSA occurred the next day, on</p>

Page 130	Page 131
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 April 17, 2019? 3 A. Yes. That is my recollection, 4 yes. 5 Q. And then these documents were 6 being sent to the board members at 7 9:43 p.m. on the 16th; is that right? 8 A. That's what this email has as 9 their sent date, yes. 10 Q. Do you have any reason to believe 11 that that's not accurate? 12 A. It's what the document says. 13 Q. So the documents that are 14 attached to this email includes a 15 presentation entitled "PREPA Restructuring 16 Support Agreement Overview." 17 Is that right? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And also attached is a copy of 20 the draft RSA; is that right? 21 (Document review.) 22 Q. It's after the presentation? 23 A. Yes. Looks like the draft, yes. 24 MS. McKEEN: And I'll just note 25 for the record that that document</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 that's attached is pretty voluminous 3 and obviously the witness hasn't had 4 time to go through to make sure every 5 page is included and things like that. 6 We'll obviously accept your 7 representation for the record. 8 MR. BASSETT: Sure. Yeah, this 9 is a complete copy of what was produced 10 to us in discovery. 11 BY MR. BASSETT: 12 Q. Was a copy of the draft RSA 13 provided to the board members prior to this 14 email to which it is attached here? 15 A. I do not know what Mr. Sobrino 16 provided to the board members prior to this 17 meeting. His interaction -- I was not part 18 any interaction he had with board members. 19 Q. But you're here today as the 20 representative of PREPA and AAFAF, correct? 21 A. Yes, I am. 22 Q. And I think you even told me 23 that, although your counsel wouldn't let 24 you answer, that you had -- you had -- 25 wouldn't let you answer as to the content,</p>
Page 132	Page 133
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 you had had discussions with Mr. Sobrino 3 about the RSA, correct? 4 A. That is correct. 5 Q. So you don't know as PREPA's or 6 AAFAF's representative whether or not board 7 members received a copy of the draft RSA 8 prior to this email? 9 A. No. Based on my conversation 10 with Mr. Sobrino, we didn't discuss this 11 specifically. 12 MS. McKEEN: I'll counsel the 13 witness not to divulge the contents of 14 your conversation with Mr. Sobrino on 15 which lawyers were present. 16 BY MR. BASSETT: 17 Q. Okay. So you're unprepared -- 18 just to be clear, you are you're unprepared 19 to answer that question today because you 20 don't know? 21 MS. McKEEN: Counsel, I think 22 that misstates the witness' testimony. 23 A. I disagree with your 24 characterization that I am unprepared. I 25 am letting you know that I don't know</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 whether in another context or prior to this 3 or physically or in an electronic 4 communication Mr. Sobrino provided this 5 document to the other board members. 6 Q. Do you know whether anyone at 7 PREPA or AAFAF or their advisers discussed 8 the RSA with board members prior to the 9 meeting that occurred on April 17, 2019? 10 A. So part of my answer would refer 11 to my conversation with Mr. Sobrino which 12 has privileged contents, so I won't answer 13 that. 14 MS. McKEEN: I want to be clear 15 about my instruction to the witness. 16 I don't want you to give 17 testimony about the conversation 18 itself, but to the extent the purpose 19 of that conversation was to educate you 20 to give testimony here at this 21 deposition today, if there is 22 information that you learned from 23 Mr. Sobrino that would help you answer 24 that question, you may testify as to 25 what you know now on behalf of AAFAF</p>

Page 134	Page 135
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 and PREPA. If that knowledge is based 3 in part on that conversation, that's 4 okay. 5 Does that make sense to you? Do 6 you understand that distinction? So if 7 the contents of that conversation will 8 help you answer Mr. Bassett's question, 9 please do so. 10 THE WITNESS: Okay. 11 A. So it is my understanding that 12 Mr. Sobrino had informed board members 13 about the progress of the negotiations 14 related to the RSA. And formally, as part 15 of a board meeting, it is my understanding 16 that the document you have here was the 17 document that was used to explain in more 18 detail to board members the RSA. 19 Q. When you said it's your 20 understanding that Mr. Sobrino had informed 21 board members about the progress of the 22 negotiations related to the RSA, when did 23 he do that? 24 A. I don't know which specific 25 meetings or whether it was outside of the</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 formal meetings that -- board meetings that 3 took place, but he did have conversations 4 with them about the progress of the RSA 5 negotiations. 6 This was, as you know, a very 7 public topic and so as part of his duties, 8 he would keep people abreast of what was 9 happening. 10 Q. Were each of those conversations 11 or meetings, or in whatever context they 12 occurred, with all of the board members? 13 A. I don't know. 14 Q. And, again, you don't know when 15 these conversations took place? 16 A. No, I do not know. 17 Q. Was the RSA, to your knowledge, 18 discussed at any prior board meetings of 19 PREPA or AAFAF? 20 A. The RSA, my understanding was 21 that this was the only formal presentation 22 that was made to discuss the RSA at the 23 board level, both at AAFAF and PREPA. 24 Q. Can I now please direct your 25 attention to what's been marked as Batlle</p>
Page 136	Page 137
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 Exhibit 10. Go ahead and take your time to 3 familiarize yourself with this document, if 4 you need it. 5 (Document review.) 6 Q. Whenever you're ready, 7 Mr. Batlle. I'm not going to ask you about 8 every single line in the document. 9 A. So I'll let you know. I'm still 10 on the next to last page. 11 (Document review.) 12 A. I am ready. 13 Q. So is it your understanding, 14 Mr. Batlle, that what I've handed you 15 that's been marked as Exhibit 10 is a copy 16 of the minutes from the meeting that 17 occurred on April 17, 2019? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. The meeting began at 10:25 a.m. 20 in the morning; is that right? 21 A. That is what the minutes say, 22 yes. 23 Q. And I think the minutes close by 24 saying the meeting adjourned at 12:04 p.m.; 25 is that right?</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 A. Yes, that's what the minutes say. 3 Q. So according to the minutes, the 4 meeting lasted about an hour and a half? 5 A. Approximately, yes. 6 Q. So after having -- you attended 7 the meeting, correct? 8 A. Yes, I was present in that 9 meeting. 10 Q. After having reviewed the minutes 11 and after having been at the meeting, do 12 these minutes accurately reflect what 13 occurred at the meeting, in your view? 14 A. Yeah, that what I can recall 15 today of the meeting in April, I think it 16 does. 17 Q. Do you see anything that is 18 inaccurate? 19 A. Not really. 20 Q. Anything that was discussed that 21 is not mentioned in these minutes? 22 A. Well, this document was discussed 23 in the meetings. 24 Q. Okay. 25 MS. McKEEN: Nick, can we take a</p>

Page 138	Page 139
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 quick break? 3 MR. BASSETT: Yeah, sure. 4 MS. McKEEN: Okay. Can we go off 5 the record? 6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 7 12:19 p.m. We are going off the 8 record. 9 (Recess is taken.) 10 (Batlle Exhibit 11, Document 11 entitled "Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 12 Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority 13 Governing Board Resolution Definitive 14 Restructuring Support Agreement 15 Resolution Number 4695, Tomás Torres, 16 Board Member Consumers Representative, 17 dissenting," Bates-stamped 18 PREPA_RSA0027814 through 278817, marked 19 for identification, as of this date.) 20 (Batlle Exhibit 12, Letter dated 21 5/7/19 from Tomás Torres to Eli Diaz 22 Atienza, Bates-stamped PREPA_RSA0028029 23 through 28033, marked for 24 identification, as of this date.) 25 (Batlle Exhibit 13, Email dated</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 5/22/19 from Cintron Solla to Fernando 3 Batlle,, Bates-stamped PREPA_RSA0029338 4 through 29338 with attached 5 TransPerfect translation certification, 6 marked for identification, as of this 7 date.) 8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 9 12:30 p.m. We are on the record. 10 BY MR. BASSETT: 11 Q. Mr. Batlle, are you familiar with 12 the demand protections that exist under the 13 RSA? 14 A. Yes, I am. 15 Q. And would you consider that to be 16 a material part of the RSA? 17 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form 18 of the question. 19 A. It is a part of the RSA. 20 Q. It could lead to the increase in 21 rates going forward in the event of 22 non-payment by certain customers. 23 Is that generally your 24 understanding? 25 A. That is -- it could lead to the</p>
Page 140	Page 141
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 increase for government parties 3 specifically going forward, yes. 4 Q. All right. So the Demand 5 Protection Term Sheet could not result in 6 an increase in rates for PREPA's 7 non-government customers? 8 MS. McKEEN: Objection. 9 Misstates testimony. 10 A. Can you repeat the question? 11 Q. I thought what you said was that 12 the Demand Protection Term Sheet, the way 13 it works, it could result in an increase in 14 the rates of government customers going 15 forward under certain circumstances? 16 A. I'm sorry, say that again. You 17 said in the rate of government customers? 18 Q. Yes. 19 A. No. 20 Can you repeat your question? I 21 want to make sure I'm being responsive to 22 what you're asking. 23 Q. Yes. Right. 24 Is it your understanding that the 25 Demand Protection Term Sheet, the way it</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 works is that under certain circumstances, 3 the transition charge, which is otherwise 4 capped, could be increased in subsequent 5 years for all of PREPA's customers? 6 A. There is a provision that if 7 there is delinquency of government 8 entities, the first 1.5 percent of that 9 delinquency is absorbed by creditors, but 10 if there is anything above that, then there 11 would be an adjustment to the transition 12 charge for that amount, yes. 13 Q. It's not just nonpayment by 14 government parties, though, right; it's 15 nonpayment by any customer? 16 A. No, it's a government. 17 Q. Only the government parties? 18 A. If you allow me, let me... 19 (Document review.) 20 Q. In the interest of time, I'll 21 withdraw the question. 22 A. Okay. 23 MS. McKEEN: Counsel, if the 24 witness would like to clarify his 25 answer, I think we should let him do</p>

Page 142	Page 143
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 that.</p> <p>3 MR. BASSETT: Okay.</p> <p>4 BY MR. BASSETT:</p> <p>5 Q. You want to clarify your answer?</p> <p>6 MS. McKEEN: Did you want to --</p> <p>7 it seemed like you were looking at the</p> <p>8 document to try to refresh your</p> <p>9 recollection.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: There is nothing</p> <p>11 anything in here that I thought might</p> <p>12 help me refresh my memory. No, there's</p> <p>13 nothing here.</p> <p>14 MS. McKEEN: And if there is</p> <p>15 another document that would be helpful</p> <p>16 to you to refresh your recollection,</p> <p>17 you can let Mr. Bassett know.</p> <p>18 A. Yeah. Well, there is a -- in the</p> <p>19 term sheet, there is a specific section</p> <p>20 that addresses this, and I'm just trying to</p> <p>21 recall the specific circumstances under</p> <p>22 that transition charge would change. And I</p> <p>23 specifically recall the government parties,</p> <p>24 but I'd like to be able to read that</p> <p>25 section before completing my answer.</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Let me direct your</p> <p>3 attention back to Exhibit 11.</p> <p>4 Oh, I'm sorry. That's the wrong</p> <p>5 number. I apologize. It is Exhibit 9.</p> <p>6 I'm sorry.</p> <p>7 A. Okay.</p> <p>8 Q. I'm looking specifically at the</p> <p>9 presentation that was provided in advance</p> <p>10 of the board meeting. If you go to page 9</p> <p>11 of that presentation.</p> <p>12 A. Okay.</p> <p>13 Q. At the bottom, it says, "certain</p> <p>14 items not yet agreed."</p> <p>15 It has demand protections and</p> <p>16 securitization protections and the form of</p> <p>17 9019 motion in order.</p> <p>18 Do you see that?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. What are the securitization</p> <p>21 protections?</p> <p>22 A. Those were items related to the</p> <p>23 actual vehicle through which the transition</p> <p>24 charge would -- it was enacted that also</p> <p>25 required -- those were the basis for them,</p>
Page 144	Page 145
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 the legislation that would be required to</p> <p>3 enable the implementation of the RSA.</p> <p>4 Q. So when the boards of PREPA and</p> <p>5 AAFAF met and approved the RSA, they did</p> <p>6 not have in front of them the demand</p> <p>7 protections or the securitization</p> <p>8 protections; is that right?</p> <p>9 A. That is correct because the</p> <p>10 documents were not yet agreed to.</p> <p>11 Q. How could the board approve a</p> <p>12 transaction without having these aspects of</p> <p>13 it to consider?</p> <p>14 A. Because the most material aspects</p> <p>15 of this settlement are included in the</p> <p>16 definitive RSA document and were explained</p> <p>17 through this presentation to board members.</p> <p>18 Q. Are the protections in the demand</p> <p>19 protections and the securitization</p> <p>20 protections material in your view?</p> <p>21 MS. McKEEN: Objection. Object</p> <p>22 to the form of the question. Calls for</p> <p>23 legal testimony.</p> <p>24 A. They are part of the agreement.</p> <p>25 I mean, they are part of what was needed to</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 be agreed with the supporting bondholders</p> <p>3 to finish the RSA.</p> <p>4 Q. Are they material parts of the</p> <p>5 agreement?</p> <p>6 MS. McKEEN: Same objections. I</p> <p>7 don't know what you mean by "material."</p> <p>8 BY MR. BASSETT:</p> <p>9 Q. Are they important?</p> <p>10 A. They are part of the deal.</p> <p>11 Without them, the deal would not have been</p> <p>12 able to be consummated or signed.</p> <p>13 Q. Who decided what provisions of</p> <p>14 the RSA needed to be finalized prior to</p> <p>15 this meeting?</p> <p>16 A. I don't understand the question.</p> <p>17 Q. I'll ask a different question.</p> <p>18 Did the board of either PREPA or</p> <p>19 AAFAF approve the Demand Protection Term</p> <p>20 Sheet and the securitization protections at</p> <p>21 a subsequent date?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. Can you go to the last page of</p> <p>24 that PowerPoint presentation, please? I'm</p> <p>25 sorry, it's not going to be the last page;</p>

Page 146	Page 147
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 it's going to be the last page before 3 getting to the annex of RSA terms. 4 (Document review.) 5 MS. McKEEN: Counsel, would you 6 giving the Bates number for the record, 7 please? 8 MR. BASSETT: Sure. The Bates 9 number for the record is 10 PREPA_RSA003003. 11 (Document review.) 12 A. Okay. 13 Q. First of all, there is an annex 14 of RSA terms here, right, behind that? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. And did you go through all of 17 that in the meeting in that hour and a 18 half? 19 A. I don't recall whether we 20 specifically went through each single page 21 of this document, but there was a 22 discussion about this document, and there 23 were interactions between the board members 24 and Mr. Sobrino and the other participants 25 of the meeting. And they asked all the</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 questions that -- they were given an 3 opportunity to ask further questions needed 4 to ask. 5 Q. Is it fair to say that any 6 discussion of particular provisions in any 7 level of detail would likely be reflected 8 on the minutes? 9 MS. McKEEN: Objection. 10 A. I mean, I don't -- I didn't write 11 those minutes, so I cannot tell you what's 12 the standard for PREPA's -- 13 Q. But you -- 14 A. Yeah, but I don't know whether 15 PREPA's -- you know, some of the stuff is, 16 was discussed, but it doesn't necessarily 17 mean everything was discussed. Or it 18 doesn't really reflect everything that was 19 discussed in the meeting, so... 20 Q. Were there any discussions of key 21 terms in any level of detail that you will 22 recall having that are aren't reflected on 23 the minutes? 24 A. I don't recall whether there were 25 specific questions or discussions around</p>
Page 148	Page 149
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 the key terms. 3 Q. Okay. On 003, I just want to ask 4 you a couple of questions. 5 There is a statement here that 6 says, "The securitization structure is 7 favorable as it provides bondholder limited 8 defaults and remedies only against SPV." 9 Do you see that? 10 A. Yes, I do. 11 Q. Are you familiar with the concept 12 of a securitization termination under the 13 RSA? 14 A. I have to review the term again 15 in the RSA if you allow me. 16 Q. Without -- okay. 17 (Document review.) 18 Q. Can I ask a different question 19 and see if it helps? 20 A. Sure. 21 Q. Do you have an understanding, 22 sir, that there is a situation in which 23 under the RSA, the securitization structure 24 can be terminated, but the bondholders 25 still receive the same benefits in terms of</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 secured allowed claims in the amount of 73 3 and a quarter percent and other benefits 4 such as settlement payments and 5 administrative claims? 6 A. Yes, that is correct. That is 7 Section 9 of the definitive RSA document 8 that is included in the -- as part of 9 Exhibit 9. 10 Q. So in that scenario, you're still 11 giving the bondholders the benefits of the 12 recoveries that the RSA provides, but the 13 government's not getting the benefits of 14 the securitization structure, right? 15 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form 16 of the question. 17 You can answer. 18 A. All this says is that if a 19 government party terminates this agreement 20 because somebody wakes up one morning and 21 says I don't want to do this agreement, 22 then bondholders would be entitled to the 23 stipulated treatment that is described in 24 this section. 25 Q. You said that if someone wakes up</p>

Page 154	Page 155
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 a stipulated treatment termination under 3 the RSA? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. And do you have an understanding 6 that in the event of a stipulated treatment 7 termination, the bondholders are entitled 8 to retain any settlement payments that 9 they've received under the agreement 10 following that termination? 11 MR. HAMERMAN: Objection insofar 12 as it calls for a legal conclusion. 13 A. I don't know what they would be 14 entitled at the end because it is my 15 understanding that the stipulated 16 treatment, the shape it takes would end up 17 being determined in a court process, I 18 believe. 19 Q. You don't have an understanding 20 under the RSA whether or not in the event 21 of -- for example, let's say, let's say a 22 bondholder breaches the RSA and a 23 termination event occurs. 24 Do you have an understanding 25 whether the bondholder who breaches the RSA</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 is entitled to retain any consideration 3 that it's received in the form of 4 settlement payments? 5 MS. McKEEN: Objection. Calls 6 for speculation and calls for a legal 7 conclusion. 8 A. No, I don't recall what -- that 9 specific termination, but I refer you to 10 the document. 11 Q. Now we may -- I may walk you 12 through the document, but I won't do that 13 right now. 14 Back to Exhibit 10, please. 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. I'd like to direct your attention 17 to page 3 of the minutes. 18 By the way, whenever it 19 references Mr. Sobrino here, it has atty, 20 period, before. 21 What is that? 22 A. It is my understanding that is 23 the abbreviation for attorney. 24 Q. Mr. Sobrino is an attorney? 25 A. That is my understanding.</p>
Page 156	Page 157
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 Q. But was he acting as an attorney 3 in these discussions? 4 MS. McKEEN: I'll object. 5 You can answer if you know. 6 A. My understanding is Mr. Sobrino 7 was acting in his capacity as a government 8 officer, not as an attorney. 9 Q. Okay. So at the top of page 3, 10 actually, the second line down -- actually, 11 let me go up above that. 12 It's -- the first line of that 13 page says, "In the original RSA, there 14 would have been an exchange of 85 percent 15 for the ad hoc and 100 percent for the 16 insurers." 17 Do you see that? 18 A. Yes, I do. 19 Q. And then the next line says, 20 "That was too high, so what we're looking 21 for is a deal that brings us certainty." 22 Do you see that? 23 A. Yes, I do. 24 Q. I think we talked this about a 25 little bit earlier, but if 85 percent for</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 the ad hoc and 100 percent for the insureds 3 -- insurers was too high and that the 4 recoveries under the RSA are, in your view, 5 not too high, at what point is there -- at 6 what point is it too high? 7 MS. McKEEN: Objection. Asked 8 and answered. 9 MS. DALE: Calls for speculation. 10 A. As I have repeatedly said today, 11 we made a determination that this RSA at 67 12 and a half, plus up to a potential 13 additional 10 percent on the tranche B 14 bondholder was a reasonable settlement. 15 Q. The next line says, "Attorney 16 Sobrino said that since we haven't been 17 doing payments on debt service since 2015, 18 the claims are accumulating as that 19 happens." 20 Do you see that? 21 A. Yes, I see that. 22 Q. What is your understanding of 23 what it means that the claims are 24 accumulating? 25 A. That interest due on the bonds</p>

Page 158	Page 159
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 continues to accumulate. 3 Q. Continues to accumulate even 4 though PREPA is now subject to a Title III 5 proceeding? 6 MS. McKEEN: I'll object to the 7 extent it calls for legal testimony. 8 You can answer if you know. 9 BY MR. BASSETT: 10 Q. A Title III case. 11 A. Under a Title III case, if you 12 are a secured bondholder, you continue to 13 accrue after filing. 14 Q. So it's your understanding, as 15 the representative of PREPA and AAFAF, that 16 in a Title III case, all secured creditors 17 continue to accrue interest post filing? 18 MS. McKEEN: I'm going to object 19 the question. Calls for a legal 20 conclusion of a witness who is not a 21 lawyer. 22 You can answer if you know, but I 23 don't want you to speculate. 24 A. Generally speaking, that is the 25 case. That is my understanding.</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 MS. McKEEN: I'm sorry, Fernando. 3 Could whoever is on the line 4 please mute yourself. We can hear your 5 background noise. Thank you. 6 BY MR. BASSETT: 7 Q. And is it your understanding that 8 these bonds are secured? 9 A. There is a -- bondholders argue 10 that they are. And that is part of the 11 potential litigation that is out there. 12 Q. I just want to clarify because 13 you answered maybe in your personal 14 capacity instead as the representative of 15 PREPA and AAFAF. 16 But as a representative of PREPA 17 and AAFAF who is here to testify about the 18 RSA, including the process by which it was 19 approved, at this meeting and as you sit 20 here today, it's your understanding that in 21 a Title III case, secured claims continue 22 to accrue interest after the Title III 23 petition date? 24 MS. McKEEN: Same objections. 25 Asked and answered. Calls for legal</p>
Page 160	Page 161
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 testimony. 3 You can answer if you know, but I 4 don't want you to speculate. 5 A. I'm not going to speculate about 6 that, sir. 7 Q. Okay. And in this meeting, 8 Mr. Sobrino was using the accumulation of 9 interest as one of the reasons why the 10 settlement should be approved, right, to 11 avoid that, correct? 12 A. Well, it's a statement that he 13 makes and is reflected in the minutes. It 14 is in the minutes, yes. 15 Q. Do you know what it means for a 16 bondholder to be oversecured or 17 undersecured? 18 MS. McKEEN: Calls for legal 19 testimony. Outside the scope. 20 You can answer to the extent that 21 you know. 22 A. Yes, I know what the definition 23 of that is. 24 Q. And what is your understanding? 25 A. If you're oversecured or</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 undersecured, it means whether you have 3 sufficient -- you're covered by sufficient 4 collateral. 5 Q. Do you have any understanding as 6 to whether or not bondholders or any other 7 creditors' oversecured or undersecured 8 status bears on its entitlement to receive 9 interest after a filing date? 10 MS. McKEEN: I'm going to object 11 to the question on the grounds that it 12 calls for testimony of a legal nature. 13 And I'm going to further instruct the 14 witness not to answer to the extent his 15 understanding as to that issue is 16 informed by conversations or advice 17 that he may have received from counsel. 18 A. Yes, my understanding of that is 19 by information I received from counsel. 20 Q. Yes or no question: Did you 21 receive advice from counsel as to whether 22 or not the bonds were oversecured or 23 undersecured on the Title III petition date 24 and the consequences of that? 25 MS. McKEEN: I'm going to further</p>

Page 162	Page 163
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 object since we've been discussing 3 there is debate as to whether they're 4 secured at all. But I'll allow the 5 witness to answer as to whether or not 6 he had conversations with counsel about 7 this issue generally, if he can answer 8 on a "yes" or "no" basis. 9 A. Yes, I've had conversations 10 generally. 11 Q. Can you go to page 4, please? 12 (Witness complies.) 13 Q. I'd like to direct your attention 14 to the fourth paragraph down where it says, 15 "Attorney Mitchell..." 16 That's Nancy Mitchell of 17 O'Melveny; is that correct? 18 A. I believe so, yes. 19 Q. "...said that if we can't get to 20 an agreement on the documentation related 21 to the bond deal, we still have to provide 22 them the value. We have embedded this 23 haircut for all time and can give it in a 24 different form." 25 Do you see that?</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Is this generally a reference to 4 the securitization termination that we were 5 talking about? 6 A. It is generally referenced to the 7 stipulated treatment, yes. 8 Q. Later on in that page, the second 9 paragraph from the bottom, it says 10 "Mr. Batlle," you, "said this is one of the 11 most complex transactions you would see 12 anywhere." 13 Do you see that? 14 A. Yes, I do. 15 Q. Do you agree with that statement? 16 Is that a statement that you made at the 17 meeting? 18 A. Yes, that is a statement that I 19 made in the meeting that is reflected in 20 these minutes. 21 Q. Why did you say that? 22 A. I said that because this is a 23 transaction that involves a significant 24 amount of different stakeholders, creditor 25 groups with different perspectives. It is</p>
Page 164	Page 165
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 in the middle of a very politically charged 3 environment. And so the deliberative 4 process related to a -- one of the largest 5 utilities in the U.S. under an unproven 6 statute like PROMESA creates for many 7 complexities. And so what I was trying to 8 say in relation to that is that the process 9 to get into this RSA was one -- was a very 10 complex one and time-consuming one. 11 Q. And is the resulting transaction 12 complex? 13 A. No, the result of the transaction 14 is a settlement that helps PREPA exit Title 15 III. The professionals that are involved 16 in the process get paid to deal with the 17 complexities of this. So the end result is 18 a settlement that is not complex to 19 explain, but getting there was a complex 20 process. 21 Q. You don't think this is a complex 22 transaction to explain? 23 A. I just said that it is a very -- 24 it was a complex transaction, and I stand 25 by my comment.</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 I think that you can explain it, 3 and this document's intention was to do 4 that, the document that you're referencing, 5 Exhibit 9. If you're going to go line by 6 line and then start explaining every single 7 detail, yes, it can be complex; I'm not 8 going to deny that. But in the end, this 9 was something that was reached with the 10 support of very sophisticated advisers on 11 both sides. And, yes, it is complex, but 12 you can sit down and explain it in a 13 relatively simple way in terms of what it 14 achieves. 15 Q. Go to on the top of the next 16 page, please. 17 (Witness complies.) 18 Q. This says, "To provide for 19 additional time" -- and I'll let you read 20 it. I'm just going to paraphrase here for 21 the sake of expediency. 22 Is it fair to say that there was 23 a member of the PREPA governing board who 24 voiced a concern about the amount of time 25 that the board members had to consider the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 166</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 documents that were provided in advance of</p> <p>3 the meeting?</p> <p>4 A. Yeah, the statement here has</p> <p>5 Mr. Torres indicating that.</p> <p>6 Q. Who is Mr. Torres?</p> <p>7 A. He is a board member.</p> <p>8 Q. And then in response to that</p> <p>9 concern, Mr. Sobrino -- well, strike that.</p> <p>10 Mr. Torres asked that the vote on</p> <p>11 the RSA be postponed until the next meeting</p> <p>12 which was scheduled for April 23rd,</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, that is what the minutes</p> <p>15 reflect.</p> <p>16 Q. And in response to that,</p> <p>17 Mr. Sobrino stated the importance of voting</p> <p>18 on the 17th; is that right?</p> <p>19 A. Voting on that day, correct.</p> <p>20 Q. What was the importance on voting</p> <p>21 on the 17th and not waiting until the 23rd?</p> <p>22 A. It was Mr. Sobrino's opinion that</p> <p>23 voting in favor of the document -- of the</p> <p>24 settlement and moving on to complete</p> <p>25 everything else was important. Timing was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 167</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 important in getting this done.</p> <p>3 Q. They couldn't have waited six</p> <p>4 days?</p> <p>5 A. Well, I am not a board member. I</p> <p>6 can read what the board member said here,</p> <p>7 that the majority did not need a separate</p> <p>8 session to vote. So in their</p> <p>9 determination, this was fine, voting on</p> <p>10 that day.</p> <p>11 Q. Why was there an urgency at all?</p> <p>12 A. I'm sorry?</p> <p>13 Q. Why was there any urgency at all</p> <p>14 to approve the RSA at this point?</p> <p>15 A. Well, we all want to exit from</p> <p>16 the Title III process so everything, in my</p> <p>17 opinion, should be handled with as much</p> <p>18 urgency as possible. And we were at a</p> <p>19 point where the documentation was in enough</p> <p>20 level of completeness to present it to the</p> <p>21 board for approval.</p> <p>22 Q. But there was no specific</p> <p>23 deadline or event or anything like that</p> <p>24 that required this to be approved on an</p> <p>25 urgent basis at this time?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 168</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 MS. McKEEN: Object to the form.</p> <p>3 BY MR. BASSETT:</p> <p>4 Q. Aside what you testified about</p> <p>5 generally wanting to exit Title III sooner</p> <p>6 rather than later?</p> <p>7 MS. McKEEN: Same objection.</p> <p>8 A. Yeah, I don't recall whether</p> <p>9 there was a date in black and white, but I</p> <p>10 do know that there were conversations</p> <p>11 between the supporting bondholders and the</p> <p>12 government parties about signing the RSA.</p> <p>13 And there was some expectations about</p> <p>14 getting it done, and so generally speaking,</p> <p>15 as I said, it's in everybody's best</p> <p>16 interest to apply the highest level of</p> <p>17 urgency to exit Title III, and this is a</p> <p>18 step in that direction.</p> <p>19 Q. I'd like to direct your attention</p> <p>20 to what's been marked as -- and I'd like to</p> <p>21 try to do this just to speed things up all</p> <p>22 at once. They've already been distributed</p> <p>23 to everybody else, but I'm going to hand</p> <p>24 you what's been marked as exhibits 11, 12</p> <p>25 and 13.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 169</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 MS. McKEEN: Can you tell us</p> <p>3 which is which?</p> <p>4 MR. BASSETT: Yeah, sure.</p> <p>5 11 is the resolution. 12 is the</p> <p>6 letter dated May 7, 2019. And then the</p> <p>7 email is 13.</p> <p>8 BY MR. BASSETT:</p> <p>9 Q. Mr. Batlle, take your time with</p> <p>10 these documents. I do not intend to ask</p> <p>11 you extremely detailed questions about</p> <p>12 them, but I'm happy to allow you to pause</p> <p>13 in response to my questions to review it in</p> <p>14 a little more detail if you'd like.</p> <p>15 I'm putting that out there in the</p> <p>16 interest of moving things along, but</p> <p>17 obviously take your time.</p> <p>18 (Document review.)</p> <p>19 Q. Just to spoil the surprise, I'm</p> <p>20 generally just going to ask you what was</p> <p>21 the response to these documents. So it's</p> <p>22 not going to be a detailed overview or a</p> <p>23 detailed discussion of them.</p> <p>24 A. Okay.</p> <p>25 (Document review.)</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 170</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 A. Okay.</p> <p>3 Q. Directing your attention to</p> <p>4 Exhibit 11 first, just generally, based on</p> <p>5 your review of the document -- first of</p> <p>6 all, have you seen this document before?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Is it fair to describe this as</p> <p>9 Tomas Torres's formal dissent to the</p> <p>10 approval of the RSA?</p> <p>11 A. That is my understanding from</p> <p>12 reading this document, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Just generally, what is your</p> <p>14 understanding of the basis for his dissent?</p> <p>15 MS. McKEEN: Objection. The</p> <p>16 document speaks for itself.</p> <p>17 A. Yeah, I mean, you can read what</p> <p>18 he believes should have been done for him</p> <p>19 to vote for the transaction or not.</p> <p>20 Q. He concludes by saying he would</p> <p>21 have "ordered an economic impact study to</p> <p>22 confirm the capacity of PREPA, electricity</p> <p>23 consumers, and of the Puerto Rico economy</p> <p>24 to carry the transition charge as described</p> <p>25 in the agreement considering the additional</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 171</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 aggregated charges described."</p> <p>3 Do you see that? It's the last</p> <p>4 paragraph.</p> <p>5 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>6 Q. And I think you said before but</p> <p>7 no such study was conducted, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Right, but Mr. Torres is entitled</p> <p>9 to his opinion. There were other</p> <p>10 independent board members that didn't</p> <p>11 believe that was necessary, involved in the</p> <p>12 RSA.</p> <p>13 Q. What, if anything, did -- well,</p> <p>14 did any other board member agree with</p> <p>15 Mr. Torres?</p> <p>16 A. The minutes reflect that the</p> <p>17 other board members voted in favor of the</p> <p>18 RSA.</p> <p>19 Q. Well, what, if anything, was done</p> <p>20 in response to Mr. Torres's dissent?</p> <p>21 A. Nothing specifically was done.</p> <p>22 Board members, like any board, are entitled</p> <p>23 to their vote and are entitled to have a</p> <p>24 different point of view. And I respect</p> <p>25 Mr. Torres, and he has a view, and he</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 172</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 expressed it here.</p> <p>3 Q. Let me direct your attention to</p> <p>4 Exhibit 12, please.</p> <p>5 (Document review.)</p> <p>6 Q. This is a letter that Mr. Torres</p> <p>7 sent to the PREPA board, correct? To the</p> <p>8 president of the board, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Correct, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. What, if anything, was done in</p> <p>11 response to this letter, including in</p> <p>12 response to Mr. Torres's statement that he</p> <p>13 believed the RSA should not have been</p> <p>14 approved given that not all the documents</p> <p>15 were available at the board meeting?</p> <p>16 A. I don't believe anything</p> <p>17 specifically was done. The board had</p> <p>18 approved the transaction. And as I stated,</p> <p>19 Mr. Torres is entitled to his opinion.</p> <p>20 Q. In the second to last paragraph</p> <p>21 of the document, it says that there was --</p> <p>22 that "the list of the ad hoc group members</p> <p>23 was not included in the copy of the RSA</p> <p>24 circulated to board members and therefore</p> <p>25 possible conflicts could not be evaluated."</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p> <p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 Do you see that?</p> <p>3 MS. McKEEN: I'll just object to</p> <p>4 the extent the document speaks for</p> <p>5 itself.</p> <p>6 You can go ahead.</p> <p>7 A. Yeah, that's what the document</p> <p>8 says.</p> <p>9 Q. Is that correct, was any conflict</p> <p>10 analysis performed?</p> <p>11 A. I don't understand what he refers</p> <p>12 to as conflict under content of 76 capital</p> <p>13 funds and investment firms.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. But prior to the vote on</p> <p>15 the RSA, the board members were not aware</p> <p>16 of who the members of the ad hoc group</p> <p>17 were?</p> <p>18 MS. McKEEN: Objection.</p> <p>19 A. I want to be clear on something</p> <p>20 here. The government parties have a</p> <p>21 responsibility to get the best deal</p> <p>22 possible and that's what they did. The ad</p> <p>23 hoc group and the supporting bondholders</p> <p>24 had a responsibility to get the best deal</p> <p>25 they can and that's what they did. A</p>

Page 206	Page 207
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 Q. What I've handed you is an email</p> <p>3 chain Bates-stamped PREPA_RSA0029088.</p> <p>4 Mr. Batlle, you appear to be</p> <p>5 copied on at least one of these emails</p> <p>6 which -- one or more of these emails which</p> <p>7 were exchanged in March of 2019.</p> <p>8 Can you just tell me generally,</p> <p>9 did you recall this email exchange, first</p> <p>10 of all?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, after reviewing it here, I</p> <p>12 recall seeing this graph, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And can you tell me generally</p> <p>14 what's going on? This looks to be an</p> <p>15 exchange primarily between people at Citi</p> <p>16 and people at Ankura where certain</p> <p>17 information is being shared.</p> <p>18 Can you just tell me what this</p> <p>19 related to?</p> <p>20 A. This is related to the -- what's</p> <p>21 called here the collection curve, I</p> <p>22 believe. And it relates to the payment,</p> <p>23 customer payments and the amount of</p> <p>24 collections. And it reflects both the</p> <p>25 total amount and then the amount excluding</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 the government.</p> <p>3 Q. And if you go to that chart that</p> <p>4 appears on that email that's the second</p> <p>5 from the top in the document and then the</p> <p>6 text above it, it says this is from James</p> <p>7 Castiglioni.</p> <p>8 Who is that?</p> <p>9 A. James Castiglioni is part of the</p> <p>10 Citi team that advises the board.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And then his email was</p> <p>12 later forwarded to you by David Brownstein.</p> <p>13 But in this his email, he says,</p> <p>14 "If I understand this, the percentage</p> <p>15 collection of all clients is 76 percent for</p> <p>16 the time period 7/1/2012 through</p> <p>17 11/1/2018."</p> <p>18 Do you see that?</p> <p>19 MS. McKEEN: Objection. The</p> <p>20 document speaks for itself.</p> <p>21 A. That's what the email says.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you have an understanding as</p> <p>23 to whether or not that is an accurate</p> <p>24 statement as to the percentage collections</p> <p>25 for PREPA during that time period?</p>
Page 208	Page 209
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 A. No, I'd have to -- if you're</p> <p>3 asking me for my understanding, I have to</p> <p>4 look at the spreadsheet where these numbers</p> <p>5 come from.</p> <p>6 Q. Who prepared the spreadsheet?</p> <p>7 A. That spreadsheet was prepared by</p> <p>8 PREPA, if I read this correctly.</p> <p>9 The second page attaching the</p> <p>10 collection current analysis prepared by</p> <p>11 PREPA.</p> <p>12 Q. So as the representative of PREPA</p> <p>13 and AAFAF and someone who was involved in</p> <p>14 the RSA, do you have an understanding of</p> <p>15 what the general collection rate was for</p> <p>16 PREPA over this time period that's</p> <p>17 addressed in this email?</p> <p>18 A. I have a general understanding</p> <p>19 based on the numbers included in this</p> <p>20 email, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Does the number 76 percent sound</p> <p>22 accurate to you during that time period?</p> <p>23 A. It sounds low, but that's what</p> <p>24 the numbers reflect.</p> <p>25 Q. Did PREPA do any analysis as to</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 what it expects the collection rate to be</p> <p>3 moving forward?</p> <p>4 A. Well, it is the expectation of</p> <p>5 the government that as part of this</p> <p>6 transformation, the selected entity that</p> <p>7 will run the T&D operation will have the</p> <p>8 right incentives to make sure that</p> <p>9 collections are as high as possible. 100</p> <p>10 percent being the optimal level and that is</p> <p>11 the expectation.</p> <p>12 Q. It's expected that collections</p> <p>13 will become 100 percent?</p> <p>14 A. No, I'm saying that an optimal</p> <p>15 level would be to be at 100 percent. I'm</p> <p>16 not saying that they're going to go to 100</p> <p>17 percent.</p> <p>18 Q. Was any analysis performed as to</p> <p>19 what's realistically expected?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you have an understanding of</p> <p>22 whether or not the -- strike that.</p> <p>23 Do you have an understanding of</p> <p>24 whether after entering into the RSA, PREPA</p> <p>25 has the ability to provide value to</p>

Page 210	Page 211
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 creditors in its Title III case other than</p> <p>3 the bondholders?</p> <p>4 MR. NATBONY: Objection.</p> <p>5 A. What do you mean by "value"?</p> <p>6 Q. Well, does PREPA have the ability</p> <p>7 to make a distribution as part of a Title</p> <p>8 III plan, for example, to creditors other</p> <p>9 than bondholders?</p> <p>10 MS. McKEEN: Objection.</p> <p>11 A. PREPA's distribution to creditors</p> <p>12 is what's represented in the RSA.</p> <p>13 Q. So all the distributions that</p> <p>14 PREPA is able to make to creditors, are</p> <p>15 those contained in the RSA?</p> <p>16 MS. McKEEN: Objection.</p> <p>17 A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.</p> <p>18 MS. McKEEN: I think your</p> <p>19 question was quite ambiguous about</p> <p>20 distributions under what. And I'd like</p> <p>21 to -- I'd ask that you follow up with</p> <p>22 the witness to make clear whether you</p> <p>23 were talking about distributions under</p> <p>24 the RSA or under a plan of adjustment,</p> <p>25 because it's not clear from the line of</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 questioning which thing you're actually</p> <p>3 talking about.</p> <p>4 MR. BASSETT: I object to the</p> <p>5 speaking objection and the blatant</p> <p>6 instruction to the witness. I think</p> <p>7 the record is clear, and I will clarify</p> <p>8 if I choose.</p> <p>9 MR. NATBONY: Well, there is an</p> <p>10 objection on the record. If you choose</p> <p>11 to ignore the objection and not</p> <p>12 clarify, that's your own risk.</p> <p>13 MR. LYNCH: Isn't this what</p> <p>14 redirect is for?</p> <p>15 MR. BASSETT: Yes.</p> <p>16 MR. NATBONY: The purpose of an</p> <p>17 objection is to give you the</p> <p>18 opportunity to correct a poorly phrased</p> <p>19 question. If you choose not to take</p> <p>20 that opportunity, that's your choice.</p> <p>21 MR. BASSETT: Maybe a proper</p> <p>22 objection. That's a speaking objection</p> <p>23 and an instruction to the witness,</p> <p>24 which was inappropriate. I will, to</p> <p>25 the extent I deem necessary, ask a new</p>
Page 212	Page 213
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 question now or in the future in this</p> <p>3 deposition.</p> <p>4 Could we take like two minutes</p> <p>5 and not even get up. I just want to</p> <p>6 confer with counsel.</p> <p>7 MS. McKEEN: Sure.</p> <p>8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is</p> <p>9 2:34 p.m. Off the record.</p> <p>10 (Recess is taken at this time.)</p> <p>11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is</p> <p>12 2:43 p.m. We are on the record.</p> <p>13 MR. BASSETT: Mr. Batlle, I do</p> <p>14 not have any additional questions for</p> <p>15 you at this point in the deposition.</p> <p>16 As I discussed with your counsel in the</p> <p>17 hallway, I'm not waiving whatever right</p> <p>18 I might have to ask another question or</p> <p>19 two later. I don't anticipate doing</p> <p>20 that, but I just wanted to put on the</p> <p>21 record that I reserve the time.</p> <p>22 EXAMINATION BY</p> <p>23 MR. LYNCH:</p> <p>24 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Batlle.</p> <p>25 A. Good afternoon.</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only</p> <p>2 Q. My name is John Lynch. I work at</p> <p>3 Wachtell Lipton Rosen & Katz. We are</p> <p>4 counsel for Cortland Capital Market</p> <p>5 Services LLC.</p> <p>6 Thank you for being here. I</p> <p>7 appreciate your questions -- your answers</p> <p>8 to our questions.</p> <p>9 Just a couple of follow-ups on</p> <p>10 your background.</p> <p>11 Did you do anything -- when did</p> <p>12 you graduate from Northeastern?</p> <p>13 A. 1989.</p> <p>14 Q. And did you do anything between</p> <p>15 1989 and the time you went to Harvard</p> <p>16 Business School?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>18 Q. What did you do?</p> <p>19 A. I worked for a firm that was</p> <p>20 called Metmore Financial, which is was one</p> <p>21 of the leading mortgage banks in Puerto</p> <p>22 Rico, and I was there as assistant to the</p> <p>23 CEO.</p> <p>24 Q. How long were you there?</p> <p>25 A. I was there literally from the</p>

Page 214	Page 215
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 time that I graduated from undergrad at 3 Northeastern and the time shortly before I 4 started Harvard Business School, so three 5 years give or take. 6 Q. Okay. You started Harvard 7 Business School, I guess, in the fall of 8 '92? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Okay. And you're not a lawyer, 11 right? 12 A. I am not a lawyer. 13 Q. Are you an investment banker? 14 A. I am not an investment banker. 15 Q. What do you call yourself when 16 people ask you what do you do for a living? 17 A. I am financial adviser. 18 Q. Okay. Is that a consultancy 19 role? 20 MS. McKEEN: Objection. 21 BY MR. LYNCH: 22 Q. What do you mean by financial 23 adviser? 24 A. I advise clients on matters 25 related to financial issues that include</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 restructurings. 3 Q. And how long have you been doing 4 that? 5 A. I have been with Ankura for two 6 and a half years now, approximately. 7 Q. You didn't do that before you 8 came to Ankura; is that correct? 9 A. Before I came to Ankura, I was 10 CEO of a broker-dealer called Santander 11 Securities. And as part of that role, I 12 had a unit that did advise clients in 13 financial matters, and I had oversight over 14 that unit. 15 Q. What else did Santander 16 Securities do while you were CEO? What 17 other lines of business was it engaged in? 18 A. Santander Securities was engaged 19 in retail brokerage. It also had an arm or 20 a subsidiary that did asset management and 21 the incidental business around the 22 securities, retail securities business, 23 mostly. 24 Q. I may have this wrong, so forgive 25 me and correct me, please, but I believe I</p>
Page 216	Page 217
<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 heard you testify this morning that you may 3 have had some involvement with PREPA in 4 connection with a bond offering while at 5 Santander Securities. 6 Do I have that right? 7 A. Yes, I think I said that, yeah. 8 Q. What was that? 9 A. And I don't -- 10 MS. McKEEN: I just object. I 11 think it misstates the witness' 12 testimony. 13 MR. LYNCH: That's why I asked 14 the question. 15 A. Well, what I think I said is, 16 while I was at the GDB, I did have a 17 participation. When I was at Santander 18 Securities, there were potentially clients 19 that had bonds, PREPA bonds. And I'd have 20 to look back at the dates. We might have 21 been part of a syndicate of banks that 22 might have sold PREPA bonds, but I don't 23 recall whether for the time period that I 24 was there, there was a bond issue. There 25 is a possibility there was, but I don't</p>	<p>1 F. Batlle - Professional Eyes Only 2 recall. 3 Q. What's the precise time frame or 4 as precise as you can recall that you were 5 at Santander Securities? 6 A. So I joined Santander Securities 7 in 2011, probably June, July time frame. 8 July, probably. And I left Santander 9 Securities late, probably late third 10 quarter of 2016, Septemberish type of -- 11 September, October. 12 Q. And you were there continually 13 that begin date to the end date; is that 14 right? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. Okay. In your career as a 17 financial adviser, do you have any 18 particular specialty? 19 A. No. I am versed in financial 20 matters generally. 21 Q. Do you have any particular 22 geography that you cover? 23 A. So for part of my career, I was 24 based in Puerto Rico. And then after I 25 joined Santander Securities, I -- in 2013,</p>